



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Bureau of the Census
Washington, DC 20233-0001

September 28, 2000

DSSD CENSUS 2000 PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONS MEMORANDUM SERIES CC-6

MEMORANDUM FOR Brian Monaghan
Lead Assistant Division Chief for Censuses

Field Division

Attention: Management Training Branch
Field Division

From: Howard Hogan *Howard Hogan*
Chief, Decennial Statistical Studies Division

Prepared By: John Chesnut
Mathematical Statistician, Decennial Statistical Studies Division

Subject: Observing Coverage Improvement Follow Up Operation and
Dependent Quality Assurance at the Portland, Maine Local Census
Office (LCO) on July 24 and 25.

Introduction

My observation trip consisted of observing an enumerator conducting Coverage Improvement Follow Up (CIFU) and another enumerator conducting the dependent quality assurance (QA) check for CIFU. The task at hand for the CIFU enumerator was to attempt to locate each housing unit listed in her work assignment. If a unit was located, Census Day Unit status was classified as occupied, vacant, or nonexistent. If the unit was occupied on Census Day, an interview was conducted. For Dependent QA, an enumerator verified that another enumerator classified the correct status of vacant or delete for a housing unit by visiting the unit and determining its' census day status.

CIFU Interviews

The CIFU enumerator I observed conducted several interviews for units that were occupied on census day. The following list gives the unit type and a brief description of the interview.

- *Single family home w/ apartment.* Before talking with a resident of the unit, the enumerator noticed that there was a duplicate listing of the address in the address listing book. After talking with a resident of the unit, the enumerator determined that the follow-up unit was an apartment within the house. A resident of the apartment was home and the enumerator conducted a short form interview. The respondent was able to provide all the necessary information except his girlfriend's middle name.
- *Multi-unit housing unit.* The tenant did not live there on census day. The enumerator conducted a proxy long form interview. The man was only able to provide the approximate age, first and last name of the previous tenant, and unit characteristics.
- *Single family home.* The enumerator conducted a short form interview. Five persons were included on the form. The respondent had some trouble providing the ages of her children.
- *Duplex.* The family living in the unit was of Korean origin. The respondent claimed that they already responded to census. Reluctantly, they agreed to do a short form interview. Because the respondent didn't speak very good English, the respondent's daughter answered most of the questions.

No-Contact

The enumerator was able to locate several single and multi-unit housing units in her workload assignment, but was not able to make contact with a knowledgeable respondent to determine the status of the units on Census Day. She planned to contact other sources such as building maintenance or building management to find the status of the multi-unit housing units. For the single housing units, she planned to phone or re-visit the units.

Deletes

A few times the enumerator could not find a unit and assigned it a status code of delete. Listed are two examples.

- *Multi-unit housing unit.* Two addresses listed exactly the same in the address register, except for apartment number. The apartment numbers were listed 5 and 5A. The enumerator could not locate 5A and there was nothing to indicate that it ever existed. Thus, 5A was assigned a status code of delete.
- *Multi-unit housing unit.* The enumerator could not locate 1 of 3 apartments listed at the address. The structure possessed 3 mailboxes. Only two of the boxes were labeled. The structure had 3 electric meters, however one was disconnected. The enumerator found 2 doors labeled with apartment numbers other than the number needed. So, the multi-unit housing unit was assigned a status code of delete.

Dependent QA

The enumerator conducting dependent QA had previous experience conducting QA in Nonresponse Follow Up as a crew leader. The dependent QA I observed did not reveal any incorrectly classified housing units. Below is a summary of the dependent QA scenarios I observed.

- *Vacant / for sale.* The enumerator talked with a neighbor. The only information provided was the owner's last name. The enumerator said that he would attempt to contact the real estate agency to determine if the unit was vacant on April 1.
- *Deletes / trailer park.* The enumerator verified that 3 units did not exist. He talked with an occupant of the trailer park who confirmed that the units did not exist on April 1. So, the status codes for the units remained as deletes.
- *Vacant / new construction units.* The enumerator talked with the developer who verified that the units were under construction and were not occupied April 1. Thus, the status codes for the units remained as vacants.
- *Delete / could not locate.* The enumerator found the street on which the unit should have been. He verified with a neighbor that the unit did not exist. Thus, the status code for the unit remained as a delete.
- *Delete / could not locate.* The enumerator located an address for which apartments were listed. However, the address was a business. We talked to the business owner and verified that the apartments listed did not exist at that address April 1. The status codes remained as deletes.
- *Delete / could not locate.* The enumerator located the street for the address he needed to find. The enumerator was looking for house number 25. The house numbers on the street ended at 12. He talked with a resident on the street and verified that the house number did not exist. The status code remained as delete.

Conclusion

My observation of the two enumerators gave me an insightful view of the procedures used in the CIFU operation. Commenting on these procedures, I thought the CIFU enumerator's use of the complete address listing pages was beneficial to finding duplicate entries of a housing unit or illustrating errors in the address listing. The dependent QA enumerator did not use the complete address listing pages while in the field, which in some instances I thought would have been useful. For example, there was a case where the enumerator needed to verify the deletes of a group of apartments. He found a group of mailboxes containing the house number associated with the apartments and three

unmarked buildings. One of the two structures contained apartments the other two were businesses. After questioning a few contacts, he determined the address he was looking for was actually a business. As mentioned above, the apartments never existed at the address. If the enumerator had referenced the complete address listing pages while searching for the apartments, he would have immediately realized the duplication of the apartments in the census.

In addition to seeing procedures performed, I was able to see first hand some of the difficulties associated with locating and obtaining the Census Day status of CIFU housing units. Locating units that were non-existent required driving or walking up and down roads searching for the desired house number and then sometimes having to make numerous contacts to verify the non-existence of the unit. Determining the census day status of a unit was difficult if no contacts could be made to ask about the unit or the contacts did not know anything about the unit.

cc: DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series List

J. Treat	DSSD
D. Sheppard	"
M. Rosenthal	"
M. Sutt	"
R. Pennington	"
K. Zajac	"
C. Dimitri	"
M. Tenebaum	"
J. Imel	"
E. Whitworth	"
N. Carter	"
R. Piegari	"
R. Harris	Field
A. Dukakis	Boston RO